R480W-2
5/22/89 A

EDUCATION WEEK

American Education's Newspaper of Record | Volume VIII, Number 33, May 10, 1989 | *© 1989 Editorial Projects in Education / $2.50*

Open Records: A 'Legitimate Public Interest'?

'Rumor and Suspicion' Fuel Demands for Access

The Bismarck Tribune

Madonna Tibor, a parent who won access to teacher's personnel file.

By Lisa Jennings

When Madonna Tibor asked school officials in the small town of Hebron, N.D., to let her see the records of her son's teacher, she had no idea she was launching a freedom-of-information crusade that would send her first to the courts and then to the state capital.

That was in 1987, when she and about 40 other Hebron parents were concerned over problems their children were having in a business-education class at the town's only school. They wanted to know whether any complaints about the teacher had ever been lodged with the school district.

As a city worker, Ms. Tibor knew that the records of public employees were open in North Dakota, so she simply asked for the teacher's files.

"If the district had given us the information then," she says, "it would have done away with a lot of rumors and suspicion."

But the district refused, citing the privacy rights of the teacher.

Ms. Tibor has since won a victory in the North Dakota Supreme Court and a gubernatorial veto of legislation exempting teacher records from the state's open-access law. And she remains firm in her conviction that taxpayers deserve to know all there is to know about those who teach their children.

She is not alone. The Hebron case is one of several nationwide this year to focus attention on the delicate balance between a school employee's privacy and the public's right to secure protection for its children and accountability from the system.

Continued on Page 20

'Wall Chart' Data Indicate Plateau In Reform Drive

Situation 'Scares Me,' Says E.D. Secretary

By Julie A. Miller

WASHINGTON—Secretary of Education Lauro F. Cavazos last week reported that the nation's educational performance is "stagnant" and called on "every American" to join in an effort to improve it.

The Secretary issued that call to arms at the presentation of the Education Department's sixth annual "wall chart," a compilation of education indicators by state that he said showed too little improvement since last year.

Wall chart, pages 16-17

"The good news is that the schools are not worse; the bad news is that we are not making progress," Mr. Cavazos said. "We are standing still, and the problem is that it's been this way for three years in a row."

"And, frankly, the situation scares me, and I hope it scares you, too," he told an assembly of about 150 reporters.

The wall chart tracks by state such indicators as college-entrance-examination scores and test-taking rates, high-school graduation rates, teacher salaries, pupil-teacher ratios, and education spending. It also shows which states have implemented certain education reforms and provides demographic statistics for each state.

This year's chart includes new columns showing the percentage of each state's test takers who obtained high scores and the percentage of high-school graduates who took advanced-placement examinations.

The test-score data include public- and private-school students, while information on "inputs," such as spending per capita, applies only to public schools.

The current data show that the 18.8-point average score of students who took the

Continued on Page 15

I.B.M. Will Earmark $25 Million in Grants For School Activities

By Peter West

WASHINGTON—The International Business Machines Corporation has unveiled a $25-million grant program designed to bolster teacher training in computer-based instruction and encourage innovation in the use of educational technology.

Officials of the computer manufacturer, which has been moving to gain a greater share of the precollegiate market, made a restrained announcement of the new initiative last week during a forum here on educational technology.

"Our aim is to be a catalyst," said John C. Porter, I.B.M.'s director of university relations. "The program is intended to stimulate the broad partnerships that are needed to improve elementary and secondary education in this country, so that the United States can remain competitive."

During the five-year program, the firm will provide selected schools of education and school districts with laboratories of

Continued on Page 21

Collapses of School Bleachers Belie Company's Denial of Prior Incidents

By Peter Schmidt

Bleachers sold by Interkal Inc. of Kalamazoo, Mich., have collapsed in at least two schools in the last eight months and in at least eight schools in the last seven years, officials of the affected schools confirmed last week.

The reports indicate that the nationally publicized collapse of bleachers at Maurice J. McDonough High School in Charles County, Md., last September was not an isolated occurrance, as it was described by the company.

Altogether, more than 300 students have been involved in the known mishaps and at least 210 have been hurt, although almost all of the injuries suffered have been minor.

The most recent known collapse occurred April 15 during a 10th-grade orientation at East Burke High School in Burke County, N.C., when bleachers folded under the weight of 15 people, sending nine to the hospital for treatment of minor injuries, school officials said.

About two weeks after last fall's incident in Charles County, Md., three unoccupied bleacher seats collapsed at Edgewood High School in Harford County, Md., a district spokesman there said.

The collapse of a section of bleachers during a back-to-school program at Charles County's McDonough High School on Sept. 9 sent 83 students to local hospitals for treatment of injuries.

The Maryland Occupational Safety and Health office blamed the McDonough collapse, in part, on the failure of school employees to install removable guardrails that would have enabled them to see that the bleachers were misaligned.

Continued on Page 19

Study Finds Fast Growth in Sex Education, But Sentiment for Classes in Lower Grades

By Ellen Flax

In the most comprehensive assessment to date of how U.S. schools are approaching sex education, researchers have found dramatic growth in the number of required courses but a widespread sentiment among educators that instruction is not beginning soon enough.

The report released last week by the Alan Guttmacher Institute, a nonprofit research organization, also shows that most sex-education teachers are broaching such controversial subject areas as birth control, sexually transmitted diseases, homosexuality, and abortion.

But 8 out of 10 of the teachers, it says, feel they need more assistance in teaching such topics. And most cite inadequate support from parents and the community as one of their greatest obstacles.

The report analyzes data contained in three national surveys conducted last year by the institute with funding from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Brush Foundation, and the New York Times Company Foundation.

The findings confirm the impression of many educators that both the AIDS crisis and increasing evidence of early sexual activity among adolescents have spurred the adoption of sex-education curricula by states and school districts during the past three years.

Many of these curricula have tried to in-

Continued on Page 19

Also in the news

4 **Threat to Copy Cats?**
The U.S. copyright law may be tightened, but schools are not key targets.

6 **More Liberal Arts?**
Educators ponder how to strengthen the training of elementary-school teachers.

8 **Louisiana Turmoil**
Voters say no to a new tax plan, and the teachers' pension fund sues Ivan Boesky.

Eddie Hausner/The New York Times

NEW YORK VOTE—Low turnout in city's school elections casts new doubt on decentralized system. Page 3.

IN SUMMARY

Calling in the Experts
The Chester-Upland, Pa., school system, traditionally one of the lowest-achieving districts in the state, has turned for help to a group of four nationally known educators. **Page 4.**

Boston's Board Targeted
An advisory panel named by Mayor Raymond L. Flynn of Boston last week suggested scrapping the city's elected school board and replacing it with a smaller body appointed by the mayor. **Page 5.**

Bilingual-Aid Refund Sought
The U.S. Education Department is pressuring a tiny Vermont school district to return some $800,000 in bilingual-education aid that federal officials say was spent on ineligible students. **Page 7.**

Louisiana Reform Setback
Louisiana voters' rejection of tax changes has forced Gov. Buddy Roemer to drop a proposed teacher-pay raise and to slash budget requests for other elements of his education-reform plan. **Page 8.**

New Jersey Tests Choice
Gov. Thomas H. Kean of New Jersey last week unveiled a trial plan under which parents in six districts could choose any school in the district, and dropouts could pick any school in the state. **Page 9.**

Special-Education Standards
After considerable controversy, the U.S. Education Department has issued regulations requiring some states to toughen their standards for certifying special-education personnel. **Page 12.**

Asbestos Grants Awarded
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has awarded $45 million in loans and grants to 327 schools for asbestos-abatement projects; a chart lists the amounts going to each state. **Page 13.**

Appointments	25
Books	23
Capital Update	14
Commentary	32
Deadlines	25
Events	25
Federal File	12
Honors	26
Letters	24
Marketplace	27
Special Education	6
State Journal	8
Thinking About Education	22

EDUCATION WEEK (ISSN 0277-4232) is published 40 times per year (weekly except for the first week in January, the last week in June, the month of July, the first four weeks in August, and the last two weeks in December) by Editorial Projects in Education, Incorporated. Editorial and advertising sales offices are located at 4301 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 250, Washington, D.C. 20008. (202) 364-4114. Subscriptions: U.S.: $49.94 for 40 issues. Canada: $72.94 for 40 issues. Foreign: $114.94 (airmail) and $82.94 (surface mail) for 40 issues. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to EDUCATION WEEK, P.O. Box 6987, Syracuse, N.Y. 13217. Volume VIII, Issue 33.

ACROSS THE NATION

NATIONAL

Five Districts Pressed To Finance Cleanup Effort at Toxic-Dump Site

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has moved to require five school districts in Kentucky and Ohio to help pay the costs of cleaning up a toxic-dump site left by a hazardous-waste-disposal firm with which they had contracted.

The largest case involves the Jefferson County, Ky., school system, which agreed last month to pay $20,000 to the E.P.A. for cleanup of a contaminated site containing an estimated 1,000 gallons of the district's chemical wastes.

The five districts were among 132 businesses and institutions cited for having contracted with Pristine Inc., an Ohio firm that the federal agency claims used improper procedures for incinerating and disposing of hazardous materials.

Under the federal "Superfund" law, the producers of hazardous wastes are responsible for cleaning up toxic sites, even when the materials were initially disposed of by an independent contractor.

Federal officials estimate that it will cost $13 million to take care of the dump site, which is located near Cincinnati.

Three of the four districts in Ohio that were asked to pay $2,000 each have agreed to the E.P.A.'s settlement offer.

The four districts that have accepted the federal offer will be absolved of most future liability regarding the site.

But the Cincinnati school district, which did not respond to the agency's offer by a mid-April deadline, may be subject to a lawsuit by the E.P.A.

STATES

Idaho Board Delays Action On Alternative-Certification Plan

The Idaho Board of Education has postponed a proposal to allow people without undergraduate preparation in education to become secondary-school teachers through on-the-job training.

The decision by the board last month will make it impossible to implement the alternative-certification plan for the next school year, according to Lindy High, a spokesman for the state education department.

The board directed the Professional Standards Commission, which sets certification standards for teachers, to hold public hearings on the plan and submit a report by Aug. 15.

The proposed rule would allow people with bachelor's degrees in the subjects they wish to teach to be hired as "teacher trainees" for two years. The prospective teachers would be required to pass the National Teacher Examinations and take education courses in the summer, Ms. High explained.

"It's quite a stringent program," she added. "It's not easy for people to do it."

But the Idaho Education Association views the plan as "an attempt to circumvent certification requirements and make it easier for people to become teachers at the risk of the students," according to Gayle L. Moore, a spokesman for the union.

The I.E.A.'s delegate assembly last month voted to oppose the rule change.

■ **Maryland high-school students will not have to pass a test of writing ability to graduate this spring,** the state board of education has decided.

The board has agreed to delay until 1990 the requirement, which was to have gone into effect for the first time this year, because of concerns over the fairness of a new scoring system.

The system was changed this year to make it compatible with the scoring of the state's required reading, mathematics, and citizenship examinations.

Although every 10th- to 12th-grade student had been given a booklet describing the change, some local officials claimed the information was "unevenly disseminated and understood by students and parents," according to Curt Matthews, a spokesman for the board.

"Even though there is no legal basis for a challenge, in our opinion, there could have developed a sense of unfairness," he added.

Only 560 of the 47,000 students who took the examination this winter failed to pass it.

■ **Louisiana teachers who paid a fee to be fingerprinted and have their backgrounds checked may be eligible for refunds** under a 1988 state law that bars such charges.

The state labor department has ruled that a prospective teacher in Lafayette who paid $13 for a background check was entitled to a refund, according to Jeff Simon, director of communications for the Louisiana Association of Educators.

"Now it's a question of who owes the money," Mr. Simon said last week. The money went to the state health department and police, but may have to be refunded by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, which required the checks, he noted.

■ **Maryland's special-education rules violate federal law by promoting segregation of handicapped students,** two parent groups have charged.

In separate letters last month, Parents for Integrated School and Community Education Settings and the Maryland Coalition for Integrated Education urged U.S. Education Department officials to look again at Maryland's regulations before acting to award federal grants for the 1989-90 school year.

Although state officials have drafted proposed regulations to address many of the parents' concerns, the state school board is not expected to vote on the changes until July—weeks after the federal grants go out.

"Our letter is sort of an insurance policy to make sure the regulations change," said Mark Mlawer, executive director of M.C.I.E.

■ **Georgia officials are investigating possible antitrust violations in the sale of milk products to schools.**

Attorney General Michael J. Bowers declined last week to specify how many of the state's dairy producers may be involved. He said he had contacted local school superintendents to ask how they wanted to be represented in the case.

As a result of a similar investigation in Florida last year, several large dairy companies were ordered to pay settlements totaling $18.5 million.

Plan for Glass Booth Shattered

Eliana Martinez, a 7-year-old AIDS victim, has begun classes at a Florida school with no unusual restrictions.

The girl, who is mentally retarded and not completely toilet trained, drew national attention last summer when a federal judge ruled that she could attend classes only if confined within a glass booth, in order to prevent any possibility of transmitting the infection to other students.

In December, however, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit overturned that decision, declaring that AIDS victims could be excluded only if they posed a proven risk to other students.

As a result, U.S. District Judge Elizabeth Kovachevich ruled last month that Eliana could enter the Manhattan Elementary School for Exceptional Students in Tampa.

Rosa and Eliana Martinez

DISTRICTS

Dallas Board Votes To Seek End to Desegregation Lawsuit

The Dallas school board has voted to ask a federal court to end a desegregation lawsuit filed against the district in 1972.

As a result of the decision, lawyers for the board last week filed motions with U.S. District Judge Barefoot Sanders contending that the district no longer operates a dual school system based on race and that any vestiges of segregation have been eliminated, a spokesman for the district said.

At a tense meeting April 27, minority leaders accused the board of racism and threatened to organize demonstrations in protest of the decision, which was approved on a 6-to-3 vote. Thomas G. Jones, a black member of the board, called on parents to protest the action by taking their children out of school next fall when the state conducts its official count of students.

Black and Hispanic leaders told board members they would join forces to fight the

Department Awards Grants, Loans for Asbestos Projects

WASHINGTON—The Environmental Protection Agency has awarded $45 million in loans and grants to 327 public and private schools for asbestos-abatement projects.

Since 1985, the agency has awarded a total of $201.8 million to more than 1,500 schools under the provisions of the Asbestos School Hazard Abatement Act.

Schools that received the aid had asbestos problems judged to be among the most serious nationally by the E.P.A. and had to be in the bottom 70 percent of all districts financially.

This year, 2,383 schools applied for the awards, which will be split between public and private schools in a ratio of approximately 9 to 1. The states receiving the largest number of awards over all are Illinois, with aid totaling $9.2 million, and Indiana, with $4.3 million.

Critics contend that the program has been underfunded since its inception. The E.P.A. has never sought funding for school-abatement projects, arguing that they are a state and local responsibility. But the Congress has approved annual appropriations exceeding $40 million for the effort since 1985.

Two years ago, an internal audit by the agency found that nearly one-ninth of the money distributed in 1985 and 1986 went to projects ranked as less than critical. Since then, the agency has granted awards only to those schools with the most serious asbestos problems.

In a related development, Representative James J. Florio, Democrat of New Jersey and one of the principal backers of the 1986 legislation, has introduced a bill that would modify it.

The measure would require asbestos consultants to "provide assurance of financial responsibility for all liabilities" resulting from the work they do.

It would also bar companies that do air monitoring after an abatement project from having a financial interest in any company that has planned or carried out that activity.

The bill stiffens the requirements for those wanting to become asbestos consultants and directs the E.P.A. to develop a plan to monitor for possible health and safety violations by conducting random, on-site inspections of schools while asbestos-related activities are under way.

The bill also extends most of the rules for schools—including mandatory inspections and the development of management plans—to public and commercial buildings.

In Philadelphia, meanwhile, Superintendent of Schools Constance E. Clayton has called for the creation of a federal "superfund" to pay for asbestos-related activities.

At a press conference to announce her district's compliance with the federal asbestos law, which requires all schools to submit management plans to state authorities by this week, Ms. Clayton said that "without federal support, we will face a fiscal crisis of monumental proportions."

The district has spent $53 million on asbestos abatement and removal since 1984, and may have to spend an additional $40 million by 1995. —E.F.

Asbestos School Hazard Abatement Act Awards, 1985-1989

State	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	No. of Projects in 1989	Total 1985-1989
Alabama	$260,311	$270,543	$461,940	$413,170	$0	0	$1,405,964
Alaska	750,000	120,520	0	0	34,521	1	905,041
American Samoa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	102,493	431,020	233,351	0	124,232	4	891,096
Arkansas	299,303	265,041	589,844	1,564,136	587,975	8	3,420,299
California	261,693	439,926	306,249	212,549	3,592,152	3	4,812,611
Colorado	701,703	132,676	0	0	786,715	5	1,621,094
Connecticut	472,400	2,289,864	2,457,992	0	240,617	3	5,460,898
Delaware	263,200	0	0	0	70,604	9	333,804
District of Columbia	284,000	3,160	10,537	0	0	0	297,697
Florida	54,497	0	80,867	0	26,880	1	162,244
Georgia	553,091	0	0	0	196,844	4	749,935
Guam	0	46,643	0	0	0	0	46,643
Hawaii	0	0	309,877	0	0	0	309,877
Idaho	305,535	164,092	275,799	99,630	238,327	5	1,083,383
Illinois	1,261,786	2,028,226	2,645,780	4,019,226	9,188,449	31	19,143,467
Indiana	366,193	82,448	66,485	0	4,286,960	14	4,782,087
Iowa	470,136	623,911	521,701	368,564	249,233	17	2,433,545
Kansas	220,197	251,650	45,366	0	98,333	7	615,548
Kentucky	1,585,150	1,894,733	401,562	1,837,719	697,322	2	6,416,486
Louisiana	2,294,573	1,449,574	857,221	1,166,395	240,459	4	5,828,222
Maine	158,160	113,357	258,185	0	65,223	9	594,906
Maryland	1,549,252	3,889,275	332,178	99,009	165,450	3	6,016,162
Massachusetts	405,840	2,125,957	4,273,079	0	149,984	4	6,954,860
Michigan	816,325	1,308,542	2,836,926	378,419	1,187,865	11	6,528,077
Minnesota	617,040	726,178	2,076,221	203,169	760,251	13	4,382,859
Mississippi	403,211	2,237,435	405,805	1,046,525	1,553,649	8	5,646,625
Missouri	590,890	1,144,428	784,674	978,139	504,315	14	4,002,446
Montana	395,400	0	0	0	217,204	15	612,604
Nebraska	301,535	252,192	352,358	12,350	823,196	6	1,741,631
Nevada	1,563,293	103,154	0	0	0	0	1,666,447
New Hampshire	299,622	0	680,000	200,826	412,433	2	1,592,881
New Jersey	2,205,792	1,176,904	2,723,174	684,861	234,486	7	7,025,217
New Mexico	0	245,428	176,413	0	32,016	3	453,857
New York	1,476,074	2,162,205	3,426,522	602,581	1,564,514	12	9,233,896
North Carolina	1,350,000	528,870	1,423,308	0	99,469	18	3,401,645
North Dakota	300,774	309,861	617,963	43,049	592,804	12	1,864,451
Northern Marianas	39,798	0	0	0	0	0	39,798
Ohio	8,251,716	6,075,857	6,157,221	4,431,241	3,437,151	19	28,353,186
Oklahoma	507,536	92,081	0	0	177,767	7	777,386
Oregon	274,097	12,144	72,764	0	4,144,205	7	4,503,210
Pennsylvania	4,042,134	8,116,934	1,754,861	497,612	1,724,031	13	16,135,572
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rhode Island	484,000	225,492	0	0	0	0	709,492
South Carolina	309,215	162,250	501,000	0	57,328	2	1,029,793
South Dakota	130,279	0	196,090	0	394,576	12	720,945
Tennessee	1,075,389	3,505,552	1,418,409	1,896,482	3,297,095	31	11,194,927
Texas	5,133,313	411,673	1,091,090	446,122	1,232,085	15	8,314,283
Utah	0	0	0	0	167,280	7	167,280
Vermont	298,846	287,593	108,709	18,500	302,219	1	863,867
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	0	326,902	175,630	0	389,600	1	892,132
Washington	278,778	14,008	382,571	117,406	237,768	9	911,533
West Virginia	427,363	303,300	297,848	127,795	237,997	1	1,494,303
Wisconsin	310,027	371,898	341,350	656,705	354,461	13	2,078,149
Wyoming	388,134	0	210,836	0	68,624	2	575,648
Bureau of Indian Affairs	222,825	284,634	262,591	113,753	0	0	874,812
Total	$45,000,000	$47,000,000	$43,282,784	$22,600,000	$45,000,000	401	$201,882,784

SOURCE: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Senators Urge a Federal 'Assault' On the Problem of Adult Illiteracy

WASHINGTON—The federal government should lead an "assault" on the problem of adult illiteracy, members of a Senate subcommittee declared at a hearing last week.

"What we really need is leadership," said Senator Paul Simon, Democrat of Illinois, who chaired the hearing. "We need someone willing to lead the charge."

Senator Simon argued that a number of recent developments—including First Lady Barbara Bush's efforts on the issue—suggest that "the nation is ready to tackle it head on." He indicated he would introduce legislation aimed at strengthening and coordinating federal, state, and local literacy efforts, developing model programs, and providing incentives for public-private partnerships.

The proposed "illiteracy elimination act" also would establish a Cabinet-level council on literacy coordination and a new National Center for Literacy, which would serve as the council's research and outreach arm, he explained.

Senator Simon contrasted his proposal with current federal efforts, which he described as only having "dealt on the edges" of the problem. Although the Education Department and other agencies spend about $190 million annually on adult-literacy programs, he noted, such programs reach a small fraction of the estimated 27 million Americans over age 18 who cannot read or write.

Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Democrat of Massachusetts, pointed out that the Bush Administration recommended no increase this year in spending for adult-literacy programs.

Funding Levels Debated

Although the Administration sought an 18 percent increase—to $161 million—for adult-education grants to states, he said, the increase was nearly offset by requests to eliminate grants for workplace literacy, English-language instruction, and literacy initiatives by libraries.

Secretary of Education Lauro F. Cavazos responded, however, that the request was aimed at giving more flexibility to states. "This is not just a federal problem," he insisted. "It needs to be dealt with at every level."

D. Kay Wright, deputy assistant secretary of education for vocational and adult education, noted that the Education Department represents only a part of the federal government's literacy efforts.

"There are 79 programs in 14 different agencies all dealing with adult literacy," she said. "One of the things we must do is coordinate resources."

Secretary Cavazos added that the Administration also has addressed the problem by requesting substantial increases in funding for elementary and secondary programs.

"I believe that the key to eliminating adult illiteracy in the next generation," Mr. Cavazos said, "lies in improving the education of all our children." —E.F.

Continue your professional education this summer at Teachers College, Columbia University

Summer Institute on Management Information Systems
Assessment & IFSP Development for Infants with Disabilities
Educating Students with Dual Sensory Impairments
The Principalship: Strategies for Successful Schools
Alphabetic Phonics
The Urban Gifted: Issues of Concern
Instructional Models for the Gifted
Opticon (II) Returns: Teaching Blind & Handicapped Learners
Alternative Approaches to Identifying Gifted Students
The Artistic Process: Asthetics, Art Making & Viewing
Piano Pegagogy Institute
Choreographic Problems
LOGO in the Classroom: A Project Approach
Seventh Annual Summer Institute on Teaching of Writing
Using Computers to Teach Problem Solving & Critical Thinking
TESOL Alternatives
DSM – III-R and Legal Applications
Teacher Leadership for School Change
Interdisciplinary Curriculum Design and Implementation
Children's Literature
Teacher Effectiveness: Classroom Management
Toward "Art" in Arts Education
Responding to Diversity: Pre Kindergarten through 1st Grade
Infusing Multicultural Perspectives in Teacher Preparation

TC

For detailed information, please contact our
Office of Continuing Professional Education, Box 132
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, NY 10027
(212) 678-3614

'Wall Chart' Indicates Reform Stalling

Continued from Page 1

American College Test in 1988 was up one tenth of a point from 1987, while the combined average score on the Scholastic Aptitude Tests dropped two points to 904. Mr. Cavazos noted that in 1972 the average A.C.T. score was 19.1 and the average score on the S.A.T. was 937.

While scores have increased since 1982—by 11 points on the S.A.T. and eight-tenths of a point on the A.C.T.—the Secretary called those gains "minuscule, practically."

"Although certain states have improved their graduation rates significantly since 1982, the national average has improved by less than 2 percentage points [between 1982 and 1987]," Mr. Cavazos said. "As with test scores, our gains are minimal."

The national graduation rate actually dropped by half a percentage point between 1986 and 1987, according to the wall chart.

Mr. Cavazos said he was encouraged that the number of students taking college-entrance exams had continued to increase and that "rises in minority test scores continue to shrink the distance between their scores and those of nonminority students, slowly but steadily."

But while the United States spends more per student than foreign competitors, he noted, "our students consistently fall behind the competition in competitive testing." And although the nation will invest more than $199 billion in precollegiate education this year, Mr. Cavazos added, "increases in spending for our children's education have not been matched by increased performance."

According to the wall-chart data, the nation's average per-pupil expenditure rose to $3,977 in constant dollars in 1987, as compared with $3,752 in 1986 and $2,726 in 1982.

Average teacher salaries rose to $28,008 in 1988, up from $26,551 in 1987 and $19,274 in 1982, and the average pupil-teacher ratio continued its downward trend, dropping slightly from 17.8 pupils per teacher in 1987 to 17.6 in 1988.

AP/Wide World

Secretary Cavazos at last week's press conference.

However, the percentage of school spending contributed by the federal government continued to decline, dropping to 6.4 percent in 1987 from 6.7 percent in 1986 and 7.4 percent in 1982.

A Call for 'Commitment'

The Secretary's statement that "money alone is not the answer to our education deficit" echoes a favorite theme of his predecessor. But while William J. Bennett blamed the "education bureaucracy" for blocking reform and improvement in last year's wall-chart conference, Mr. Cavazos sought to spread the burden more widely.

"Every person must be part of the initiative to change the direction of American education," he said. "There has not been enough demand at the local level that the system improve."

"I issue a call to every American to join President Bush and me in making a commitment to educate our people, truly educate them, once again," Mr. Cavazos said. "The challenge goes to parents, teachers, administrators, public officials at all levels, and students. We must stir up the education waters in America."

He called on all states and school districts to establish their own "education improvement targets," and issue annual progress reports.

State and local officials, educators, and parents should "work together to identify and announce specific goals for improving each school, district by district, state by state; to select the benchmarks for measuring progress toward their goals, and to discuss incentives for student, teacher, and school improvement," he said.

Specific Goals Cited

Mr. Cavazos specifically called on the nation to:

- Increase the national graduation rate to at least 90 percent.
- Intervene early to trim by 50 percent the number of children who fail to be promoted to the next grade level.
- "Clearly define what every student must know and be able to do before leaving the elementary, junior-high, or the high-school level," so that students obtain "the advanced skills needed to succeed."
- Decrease truancy rates. "Having as many as a third of a classroom's desks unoccupied is unacceptable," Mr. Cavazos said.
- Increase homework. The Secretary urged parents to ensure that it is done, and urged teachers to ensure that it is meaningful.
- "Make the best use" of the time children spend in school, partially by freeing teachers from "paperwork."
- Increase by half the number of children proficient in reading, mathematics, and science.
- Improve America's ranking among nations in science and math.
- Provide "those not heading for college with apprenticeship skills at least as good as those held by students in West Germany."

The federal role in this effort, Mr. Cavazos said, is to "help bring these issues to national attention," to "highlight exemplary programs and share their results," to "reward successful schools, teachers, and students," and to "find ways to release the states from unnecessary statutory and regulatory burdens in exchange for higher performance."

Gordon M. Ambach, executive director of the Council of Chief State School Officers, issued a statement accepting Mr. Cavazos' request to help set nationwide objectives.

"Let's start with a national commitment to the policy that virtually every American student should graduate from high school," he said.

Mary Hatwood Futrell, president of the National Education Association, also accepted the Secretary's challenge to "stir up the education waters" but argued that increased federal spending is a necessary part of any improvement effort.

"If we are calling for improved performance, we are all going to have to accept the responsibility of identifying the fiscal and physical resources necessary to turn things around," she said in a statement. "What we are seeing now is the direct result of the educational neglect supported by the Reagan Administration."

Chart's Highs and Lows

Following are comparisons on test scores and graduation rates from the 1989 "wall chart."

Greatest Improvement, 1982-88

ACT states	SAT states
Alabama	S. Carolina
N. Dakota	Hawaii
Kentucky	Georgia
Mississippi	New Jersey
Nevada	Rhode Island
S. Dakota	Maryland

Least Improvement, 1982-88

ACT states	SAT states
Alaska	New York
Minnesota	Florida
Wisconsin	Pennsylvania
Nebraska	Delaware
Iowa	Vermont

Highest-Scoring States, 1988

ACT	SAT
Iowa	New Hampshire
Wisconsin	Oregon
Minnesota	Vermont
Montana	California
Nebraska	Connecticut
S. Dakota	Maryland

Lowest-Scoring States, 1988

ACT	SAT
Mississippi	S. Carolina
Louisiana	D.C.
W. Virginia	N. Carolina
Arkansas	Georgia

% of ACT Scores 26 and Up

Highest %	Lowest %
Iowa	Mississippi
Wisconsin	W. Virginia
Montana	Louisiana
Colorado	Arkansas
Nebraska	Tennessee

% of SAT Scores 600 and Up

Top 5 Verbal	Top 5 Math
D.C.	New Hampshire
New Hampshire	California
Maryland	Hawaii
Connecticut	Maryland
Massachusetts	Massachusetts
Bottom 5	**Bottom 5**
Indiana	S. Carolina
N. Carolina	N. Carolina
S. Carolina	Georgia
Georgia	Indiana
Hawaii	Texas

Highest Graduation Rates

	1987	1982
Minnesota	90.6%	88.2%
Wyoming	89.3	72.4
N. Dakota	88.4	83.9
Nebraska	86.7	81.9
Iowa	86.4	84.1

Lowest Graduation Rates

	1987	1982
D.C.	55.5%	56.9%
Florida	58.6	60.2
Louisiana	60.1	52.9
Michigan	62.4	71.6
Georgia	62.5	65.0

A Two-Tier Media Event: 'National Nature,' Local Nurture

WASHINGTON—In the six years since former Secretary of Education Terrel H. Bell inaugurated it, the Education Department's "wall chart" has gained broad acceptance as a source of state-by-state information on the nation's educational achievement.

It has also become the department's most important media event.

Last week's wall-chart news conference—the first presided over by Secretary of Education Lauro F. Cavazos—drew at least 150 journalists. Melinda Kitchell, a department spokesman, said only 132 media representatives signed a list at the door, but the crowd clearly exceeded that mark and 250 press kits were distributed by the event's end.

Big Local News

The main reason for the wall chart's popularity is that it allows representatives of local newspapers and broadcast stations to report information specific to their states.

In fact, Ms. Kitchell said, the only two events that rival it in media appeal also have built-in local angles—ceremonies for winners in the department's school-recognition and Presidential scholars programs.

For reporters representing local media, their states' comparative performance is as important—or more important—than Mr. Cavazos' assessment of the data on national achievement. For them, the morning's main task was to record or film a department official making pointedly state-specific comments.

Paula J. Faria, for instance, a reporter for In Washington, an independent news service that provides coverage for local television stations, needed quotes dealing with Virginia, Texas, Massachusetts, Nevada, South Carolina, Oklahoma, and Arkansas, and had several different logos ready to snap onto her microphone.

Department officials prepare to slake that thirst for the local angle in their staging of the event. First up last week was the Secretary's speech. Then Mr. Cavazos and Charles E.M. Kolb, deputy undersecretary for planning, budget, and evaluation, took reporters' questions.

But before Mr. Cavazos appeared, his spokesman, Mahlon Anderson, admonished the journalists to ask only "questions of a national scope," as "the Secretary's time is limited." He assured them that they would be able to obtain the all-important locally focused quotes and sound bites after the main presentation.

Brief Celebrity

When it was over, department staff cleared the room of chairs and set up four auxiliary podiums, from which questions like "What is the significance of Alabama's performance this year?" were fielded.

Mr. Kolb took some questions. But most of the E.D. officials drafted for this duty are not high-ranking, and are not likely to speak for the department on the nightly news again soon. They were assisted by a packet of sheets for each state that included its statistical data and a one-paragraph summary of the state's comparative status.

For example, while Mr. Kolb told a reporter from WISN, a Milwaukee radio station, that her state's performance was "higher than average," George Pieler, a special assistant to Mr. Kolb, lauded reforms undertaken in Florida for the representative of an independent news service similar to Ms. Faria's.

As Mr. Pieler shifted his attention to Missouri at the reporter's request, Jerry Bolshee, an aide in the office of elementary and secondary education who worked on the wall chart, discussed Oklahoma's test scores with another news-service representative. —J.M.

Ex-Chief Sanders Defends Use of 'Imperfect' Data

WASHINGTON—When the first "wall chart" was unveiled in 1984, educators attacked the Education Department's use of college-entrance-test scores to make comparisons among disparate states, arguing that the scores alone are not a fair and accurate measure.

The Council of Chief State School Officers heatedly debated the issue at a meeting later that year, with many members expressing fear that comparisons could lead to loss of revenue and local control over education in states that fared poorly.

The divided organization voted 27 to 12 to participate in developing better indicators, largely because members felt that the popularity of the "wall chart" made them inevitable. *(See Education Week, Nov. 21, 1984.)*

This year, one E.D. official attending the wall-chart news conference happened to be a 10-year member of the council and its immediate past president. But Undersecretary Ted Sanders, who defended the wall chart in an interview last week, said he did not see any conflict between the two roles.

"I don't think there's much of a difference in perspective," he said. "The questions are, 'Should we be looking at some kind of performance indicators, and are the indicators we have up to the task?' "

"The answer to the first question is 'yes,' " Mr. Sanders said, adding that, as the chief state school officer in Nevada and later in Illinois, he had proposed instituting state "report cards" comparing school districts' achievement.

The answer to the second question is "no," Mr. Sanders said. That is why both the department and the state chiefs, he added, are working to improve the way educational achievement is measured.

"Too much time ought not be spent quarreling with the adequacy of the data, but should rather be spent tending to what it is that those data suggest," he said, noting that the wall chart does not contradict findings from other assessments.

"Just because the data aren't perfect doesn't mean we shouldn't use them," he said. —J.M.

NOTE: Due to space limitations, data on population characteristics and pupil-staff ratios are not included in this reprint of the "wall chart." For footnotes and source information, see page 18.

STATE EDUCATION PERFOR

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

ACT[1] (28 STATES)

SAT[1] (22 STATES)

STATE	RANK[2]	ACT 1988[3] SCORE (1)	ACT PERCENT OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES TAKING TEST (EST.)[4] 1988 (2)	ACT PERCENT OF TOTAL SCORING 26 AND ABOVE[5] 1988 (3)	ACT 1982 SCORE (4)	ACT PERCENT OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES TAKING TEST (EST.)[6] 1982 (5)	ACT SCORE CHANGE 1982-1988 (6)	SAT 1988 SCORE (7)	SAT PERCENT OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES TAKING TEST (EST.)[4] 1988 (8)	SAT PERCENT OF TOTAL SCORING 600 OR ABOVE ON EITHER VERBAL/MATH[7] 1988 (9)	SAT 1982 SCORE (10)	SAT PERCENT OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES TAKING TEST (EST.)[6] 1982 (11)	SAT SCORE CHANGE 1982-1988 (12)	ADVANCED PLACEMENT CANDIDATES AS PERCENT OF GRADUATES 1988[8] (13)	ADVANCED PLACEMENT CANDIDATES AS PERCENT OF GRADUATES 1982[9] (14)	GRADUATION RATE ADJUSTED FOR MIGRATION AND UNCLASSIFIED STUDENTS[10] 1987 (15)	GRADUATION RATE ADJUSTED FOR MIGRATION AND UNCLASSIFIED STUDENTS[10] 1982 (16)
ALA.	NUMBER (RANK)	18.1 (21)	56.1 (28)	11.5 (21)	17.2 (26)	55.3 (13)	+0.9 (-11T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	8.6 (25T)	1.8 (31)	70.2 (34)	63.6 (44T)
ALASKA	NUMBER (RANK)	18.4[22] (19)	36.9 (27)	15.9 (-8)	18.7 (12T)	51.5 (27)	-0.3 (27T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	12.6 (16)	8.9 (-6)	66.7 (41)	66.5 (48)
ARIZ.	NUMBER (RANK)	19.3 (-9T)	36.8 (28)	16.8 (16T)	18.7 (12T)	61.2 (15)	+0.6 (-7)	–	–	–	–	–	–	8.6 (25T)	3.3 (23)	68.6 (48)	63.6 (46T)
ARK.	NUMBER (RANK)	17.9 (25)	57.9 (15)	10.5 (25)	17.7 (20)	56.5 (11T)	+0.2 (-19T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	3.7 (-49)	0.1 (-51)	77.8 (16)	73.6 (33)
CALIF.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	908 (-6T)	45.7 (21)	7.3/19.2 (-3)	899 (-6)	38.6 (29)	+9 (-15)	18.5 (-9)	8.1 (-3T)	66.1 (42)	60.1 (49)
COLO.	NUMBER (RANK)	19.7 (-7)	65.0 (10)	17.1 (-4)	19.6 (-5)	66.8 (-5)	+0.1 (-22T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	14.3 (-9T)	8.1 (-5T)	73.7 (26T)	78.9 (29)
CONN.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	908 (-6T)	78.2 (-1)	8.1/17.1 (-6)	896 (-6T)	69.1 (-1)	+12 (12)	14.3 (-9T)	7.8 (-8)	88.3 (11)	78.6 (31)
DEL.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	899 (10)	67.6 (-6)	7.3/15.8 (12)	897 (-5)	53.6 (-8)	+.2 (19)	13.6 (12)	7.9 (-7)	78.1 (35)	68.2 (34)
D.C.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	839 (21)	62.9 (11)	11.6/16.3 (-2)	821 (21)	50.6 (11)	+18 (-7T)	22.5 (-2)	10.0 (-3)	53.5 (51)	56.9 (50)
FLA.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	898 (13)	52.7 (19)	6.0/16.5 (15)	889 (-9T)	37.5 (21)	+.1 (20T)	21.1 (-3)	4.6 (20T)	58.6 (50)	59.3 (46)
GA.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	868 (19)	63.4 (10)	6.2/16.6 (20)	823 (20)	49.1 (13)	+29 (-3)	9.7 (22T)	3.1 (27T)	62.5 (47)	61.3 (47)
HAWAII	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	888 (15)	55.1 (18)	5.5/16.8 (-8)	857 (18)	47.2 (16)	+31 (-2)	12.8 (18)	6.3 (12)	78.8 (33)	78.9 (29)
IDAHO	NUMBER (RANK)	19.3 (-9T)	57.2 (17)	15.0 (13)	18.9 (10T)	59.2 (14)	+0.4 (10T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	6.0 (34T)	1.7 (32T)	78.8 (34)	74.4 (29)
ILL.	NUMBER (RANK)	18.9 (15T)	65.6 (7)	15.6 (10T)	18.6 (16)	67.6 (4)	+0.3 (-16T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	9.7 (22T)	4.7 (18T)	73.7 (32)	73.1 (-16T)
IND.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	870 (18)	58.8 (16)	6.9/15.9 (19)	869 (17)	47.1 (17)	+18 (-10)	3.9 (-47)	1.5 (-44T)	73.7 (26T)	71.7 (-23)
IOWA	NUMBER (RANK)	20.5 (-1)	62.5 (12)	18.5 (-1)	20.5 (-2)	56.5 (15)	0.0 (-24)	–	–	–	–	–	–	2.8 (-48)	0.8 (-45T)	84.6 (-5)	84.1 (-2)
KAN.	NUMBER (RANK)	19.1 (-12T)	66.5 (-6)	15.7 (-9)	18.9 (-10T)	60.8 (-9)	+0.2 (-19T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	6.8 (30T)	2.2 (29)	82.1 (-9)	80.7 (-7)
KY.	NUMBER (RANK)	18.2 (20)	60.5 (14)	11.5 (25)	17.5 (25T)	55.7 (16)	+0.7 (-3T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	7.5 (30T)	1.6 (37T)	67.4 (39)	65.9 (38)
LA.	NUMBER (RANK)	17.1 (27)	69.6 (-9)	9.5 (26)	16.7 (27)	68.8 (-3)	+0.4 (10T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	3.7 (-41T)	0.8 (-44T)	68.1 (46)	62.9 (51)
ME.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	896 (11)	59.6 (15)	5.9/16.1 (15)	870 (-8)	47.6 (15)	+.6 (17)	7.1 (33)	1.7 (32T)	79.3 (13)	78.1 (32)
MD.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	905 (-6T)	61.6 (13)	8.3/17.7 (-4)	803 (-22)	50.3 (12)	+19 (-6)	13.8 (-8)	7.7 (-9)	76.5 (25)	75.8 (26)
MASS.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	906 (-7)	71.7 (-3T)	8.3/17.5 (-5)	885 (11T)	63.6 (-2)	+19 (-5T)	13.8 (11)	7.6 (-10)	76.5 (26)	76.6 (-13)
MICH.	NUMBER (RANK)	18.8 (17)	62.6 (11)	13.9 (17T)	18.7 (12T)	51.4 (18T)	+0.1 (22T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	7.5 (30T)	3.8 (-26)	62.4[20] (-38)	71.6 (-30)
MINN.	NUMBER (RANK)	19.9 (-3T)	66.3 (-25)	16.1 (-7)	20.2 (-3)	26.9 (-28)	-0.3 (27T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	6.9 (-34)	3.8 (-30)	80.6 (-1)	80.2 (-1)
MISS.	NUMBER (RANK)	16.2 (-26)	67.9 (-4)	7.6 (-28)	15.5 (-28)	74.6 (-1)	+0.7 (-3T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	3.5 (-44T)	0.7 (-48)	66.8 (-44)	61.5 (-49)
MO.	NUMBER (RANK)	19.1 (-12T)	57.5 (-16)	14.8 (-14T)	18.7 (-12T)	65.3 (-23)	+0.4 (10T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	3.7 (-41T)	1.6 (-37T)	74.4 (-24)	74.2 (-21)
MONT.	NUMBER (RANK)	19.9 (-3T)	52.0 (-21)	17.2 (-3)	19.5 (-6)	69.5 (-20)	+0.4 (10T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	3.8 (-40)	1.1 (-40T)	86.2 (-3)	78.7 (-9)
NEB.	NUMBER (RANK)	19.8 (-3T)	67.0 (-5)	16.7 (-5)	19.9 (-4)	73.8 (-2)	-0.1 (-25)	–	–	–	–	–	–	4.2 (-37)	1.7 (-32T)	84.7 (-4)	81.8 (-4)
NEV.	NUMBER (RANK)	19.8 (-14)	44.1 (-26)	13.9 (-17T)	18.3 (-18)	44.5 (-26)	+0.7 (-3T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	11.5 (-15)	1.7 (-32T)	72.1[20] (-31)	64.8 (-48)
N.H.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	933 (-1)	79.4 (-5)	8.7/19.3 (-1)	923 (-1)	56.4 (-6)	+.8 (-16)	18.3 (-10)	5.4 (-16)	72.7 (-29)	77.8 (-11)
N.J.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	893 (-12)	71.6 (-4)	6.9/15.6 (-18)	867 (-15)	59.7 (-3)	+26 (-4)	28.5 (-1)	6.8 (-13T)	82.2 (-10)	79.2 (-12)
N.M.	NUMBER (RANK)	18.9 (-22T)	13.7 (-16)	13.1 (-20)	17.6 (-21T)	36.5 (-30)	+0.6 (10T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	8.1 (-26)	1.7 (-32T)	71.7 (-32)	69.6 (-35)
N.Y.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	893 (-10)	71.7 (-3T)	6.8/16.9 (-11)	896 (-6T)	61.6 (-1)	-7 (-22)	10.3 (-6)	11.0 (-1)	86.0 (-2)	83.0 (-2T)
N.C.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	861 (-20)	48.7 (-24)	4.3/16.8 (-23)	832 (-19)	46.4 (-18)	+16 (10T)	5.2 (-36)	5.6 (-20T)	65.6 (-45)	67.1 (-42)
N.D.	NUMBER (RANK)	18.7 (-24)	28.8 (-31)	13.2 (-19)	17.8 (-19)	49.8 (-21)	+0.9 (-15T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	4.4 (-45)	5.6 (-20T)	89.6 (-1)	85.3 (-1)
OHIO	NUMBER (RANK)	19.3 (-9T)	51.5 (-22)	15.2 (-12)	19.0 (-9)	49.2 (-21)	+0.3 (-16T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	7.4 (-32)	3.2 (-24)	82.8 (-7)	77.5 (-18)
OKLA.	NUMBER (RANK)	19.6 (-22T)	56.3 (-18)	11.4 (-22)	17.6 (-21T)	51.4 (-18T)	+0.4 (10T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	3.7 (-41T)	0.9 (-43)	78.4 (-36)	78.8 (-30)
ORE.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	923 (-2)	51.3 (-20)	7.6/16.9 (-7)	908 (-2)	41.7 (-19)	+13 (-9)	19.7 (-8)	4.8 (-13T)	73.8 (-25)	74.6 (-25T)
PA.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	886 (-15)	62.6 (-12)	5.7/15.8 (-17)	865 (-13)	51.6 (-9)	+.1 (-20T)	7.7 (-29)	4.2 (-22)	78.7 (-30)	76.9 (-14)
R.I.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	908 (-9)	63.8 (-9)	7.2/16.9 (-14)	877 (-14)	49.7 (-9)	+23 (-5)	10.8 (-14)	3.9 (-18)	81.4 (-26)	72.7 (-26)
S.C.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	826 (-22)	50.5 (-23)	4.4/16.0 (-22)	799 (-22)	48.2 (-14)	+28 (-1)	17.3 (-6)	3.1 (-27)	66.0 (-46)	61.6 (-45)
S.D.	NUMBER (RANK)	19.6 (-9T)	44.3 (-25)	14.4 (-15)	19.1 (-8)	41.2 (-24)	+0.5 (-13T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	3.7 (-41)	0.6 (-46)	77.7 (-27)	69.7 (-33)
TENN.	NUMBER (RANK)	18.6 (-22T)	65.2 (-8)	13.9 (-17)	17.3 (-23T)	36.3 (-31)	+0.3 (-16T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	6.0 (-34T)	0.7 (-48T)	63.6 (-47)	66.6 (-40)
TEX.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	879 (-17)	48.6 (-25)	5.2/15.7 (-16)	860 (-16)	38.0 (-20)	+11 (-13)	6.0 (-34T)	1.0 (-36)	69.1 (-42)	67.6 (-39)
UTAH	NUMBER (RANK)	18.9 (-15T)	79.1 (-2)	15.2 (-12)	18.4 (-17)	66.9 (-6)	+0.5 (-13T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	17.2 (-7)	11.0 (-1)	69.4 (-41)	73.7 (-27)
VT.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	909 (-3)	67.0 (-7)	7.6/16.9 (-13)	904 (-3)	55.2 (-7)	+.3 (-18)	19.2 (-20)	6.1 (-23)	78.0 (-16)	79.6 (-6)
VA.	NUMBER (RANK)	–	–	–	–	–	–	902 (-5)	64.9 (-8)	7.6/16.5 (-9)	888 (11T)	51.8 (-10)	+15 (10T)	16.2 (-7)	7.1 (-11)	75.9 (-28)	73.8 (-28)
WASH.	NUMBER (RANK)	–[21]	–	–	–[21]	–	–	–[21]	–	–	–[21]	–	–	8.6 (-25T)	3.1 (-27T)	77.8 (-17)	76.1 (-14T)
W.VA.	NUMBER (RANK)	17.6 (-26)	59.3 (-23)	9.1 (-27)	17.6 (-21T)	48.5 (-22)	+0.2 (10T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	6.8 (-30T)	0.6 (-46)	76.2 (-31)	66.5 (-37)
WISC.	NUMBER (RANK)	20.2 (-2)	58.5 (-24)	17.3 (-2)	20.6 (-1)	32.9 (-29)	-0.4 (-26)	–	–	–	–	–	–	3.6 (-46)	1.0 (-40T)	88.6 (-1)	85.1 (-1)
WYO.	NUMBER (RANK)	19.5 (-6)	61.3 (-13)	13.6 (-18T)	19.2 (-7)	32.2 (-17)	+0.3 (-16T)	–	–	–	–	–	–	3.3 (-46T)	1.0 (-42T)	80.3 (-22)	78.6 (-15T)
		18.8	–	14.0	18.6	–	-0.2	906	–	7.3/17.6	893	–	+13	14.4	4.7	71.0	69.2

MANCE CHART, 1982 and 1988

RESOURCE INPUTS

AVERAGE TEACHER SALARY[11] ESTIMATED 1988 (17)	1982 (18)	PUPIL/TEACHER RATIO[12] 1988 (19)	1982 (20)	FEDERAL FUNDS AS PERCENT OF SCHOOL REVENUES 1987 (23)	1982 (24)	CURRENT EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL 1987 (25)	1982 (26)	EXPENDITURES AS PERCENTAGE OF INCOME PER CAPITA 1987 (27)	1982 (28)	EXPENDITURES FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL CURRENT EXPENDITURES[14] 1987 (29)	1982 (30)
$25,320 (41)	$15,612 (45)	19.3 (43)	20.7 (43)	11.7 (43)T	14.9 (23)T	$2,575 (49)	$2,063 (43)	21.5 (40)	25.4 (29)	48.5 (_)T	39.5 (36)
40,424 (1)	31,924 (1)	17.5 (29)T	16.8 (9)T	11.7 (43)T	7.3 (26)T	8,819 (1)	6,312 (1)	45.9 (1)	36.2 (1)	33.3 (51)	32.8 (51)
27,388 (22)	19,211 (21)	18.6 (30)	19.8 (37)	9.8 (15)	9.5 (16)	3,544 (35)	2,462 (33)	26.8 (32)	26.8 (25)	61.2 (25)T	62.7 (19)
29,340 (14)	14,384 (38)	17.1 (24)T	18.6 (29)	11.5 (7)T	14.9 (23)T	2,733 (46)T	1,861 (50)	25.8 (38)	21.5 (41)T	44.6 (10)T	45.1 (9)
33,199 (5)	22,755 (6)	22.9 (50)	23.1 (50)	7.1 (21)T	9.5 (15)	3,728 (30)	2,671 (27)	20.9 (51)	20.2 (49)	36.8 (47)T	37.1 (46)
28,651 (17)	19,577 (17)	18.8 (35)T	18.7 (30)	4.9 (38)T	5.3 (38)T	4,147 (18)	2,914 (17)	26.6 (21)	25.8 (31)	39.5 (37)	38.8 (39)T
33,487 (4)	18,858 (22)	13.3 (1)	15.8 (1)T	4.4 (45)T	4.9 (45)T	5,435 (5)	3,188 (9)	25.6 (27)T	22.8 (36)	41.8 (7)T	41.2 (25)T
29,573 (13)	19,298 (20)	16.1 (18)	17.8 (22)T	7.7 (18)	10.4 (12)	4,825 (9)	3,198 (8)	28.9 (13)	27.8 (11)	38.6 (41)	37.4 (43)
34,765 (2)	24,265 (3)	13.9 (3)T	18.5 (26)T	10.3 (11)	13.1 (6)	5,742 (4)	3,792 (3)	28.1 (15)	25.7 (17)	45.8 (3)T	39.8 (33)
25,198 (28)	16,788 (36)	17.4 (31)	19.9 (38)T	7.2 (28)	8.4 (28)T	3,796 (25)	2,665 (34)	24.3 (36)	21.6 (40)	36.8 (48)	35.4 (49)
26,198 (26)	16,365 (41)	18.7 (48)	18.8 (31)T	7.1 (21)T	10.7 (11)	3,376 (30)	2,019 (44)	25.6 (30)T	20.5 (47)T	40.6 (32)T	46.5 (5)
29,788 (16)	22,542 (7)	21.6 (49)	22.7 (48)	11.8 (2)T	11.7 (9)	3,787 (26)	2,862 (28)	24.2 (37)	24.5 (23)	33.9 (50)	38.8 (30)T
22,242 (44)	16,481 (40)	20.7 (48)	20.9 (45)	8.9 (14)T	8.2 (24)	2,585 (48)	1,965 (49)	21.8 (47)T	21.0 (43)	42.9 (12)T	43.5 (14)
29,665 (12)	21,928 (11)	17.2 (27)T	18.5 (26)T	6.5 (40)	6.5 (40)T	4,186 (10)	2,956 (15)	25.0 (33)	23.7 (26)T	45.7 (5)T	44.3 (13)
26,881 (25)	18,636 (26)	17.9 (32)	20.8 (46)	6.9 (36)T	6.1 (50)	3,556 (34)	2,586 (36)	25.6 (27)T	22.5 (34)	45.6 (15)	44.8 (10)
24,867 (30)	18,270 (26)	15.6 (14)T	16.5 (11)T	5.1 (34)T	5.2 (41)T	3,888 (24)	2,874 (19)	26.7 (19)T	26.5 (16)T	40.6 (32)T	40.8 (29)
24,647 (32)	16,712 (37)	15.4 (12)	15.7 (5)T	4.8 (41)T	5.3 (38)T	3,935 (21)T	2,815 (21)	26.8 (26)	25.7 (26)T	42.7 (19)	41.9 (22)T
24,253 (33)	17,298 (32)	18.2 (35)T	20.8 (44)	11.6 (6)	14.3 (6)	2,733 (46)T	1,986 (47)	22.7 (44)	20.7 (45)	49.8 (1)	47.3 (2)T
21,209 (48)	17,930 (28)	18.5 (38)	19.6 (35)	11.5 (7)T	9.6 (14)	3,869 (14)	2,588 (30)	26.7 (19)T	25.3 (19)	40.3 (34)	38.6 (38)
23,625 (40)	15,185 (46)	14.9 (7)	18.8 (24)	6.6 (26)	7.9 (25)	3,858 (23)	2,221 (41)	27.6 (16)	23.2 (30)	38.3 (45)	40.5 (30)
30,933 (8)	21,128 (10)	17.1 (24)T	18.5 (26)T	5.1 (34)T	6.6 (30)	4,277 (10)	3,234 (7)	26.6 (22)T	23.6 (10)	40.1 (35)	40.1 (31)T
30,295 (10)	20,249 (13)	15.9 (3)T	15.2 (3)	6.9 (30)T	5.2 (41)T	3,969 (7)	3,137 (11)	25.9 (16)	25.6 (21)	44.1 (12)T	47.1 (4)
32,926 (6)	20,304 (2)	20.1 (46)	22.9 (49)	8.9 (13)	9.5 (37)	4,333 (14)	3,148 (10)	28.3 (14)	28.3 (7)	48.7 (2)T	36.7 (49)T
29,988 (11)	19,987 (14)	17.1 (24)T	17.1 (16)	6.2 (40)	6.7 (47)	4,188 (17)	2,988 (18)	25.7 (24)T	25.2 (20)	41.2 (29)T	41.9 (22)T
29,562 (20)	16,135 (31)	18.8 (45)	19.3 (34)	10.5 (10)	18.3 (1)	2,330 (51)	1,706 (51)	22.8 (43)	21.3 (41)T	48.8 (3)T	48.8 (7)
24,789 (31)	16,413 (39)	16.2 (19)T	17.0 (15)	6.3 (27)T	8.4 (20)T	3,472 (36)	2,362 (37)	23.6 (39)T	21.7 (38)T	45.6 (7)T	44.0 (6)
23,798 (38)	17,778 (29)	15.8 (16)	16.5 (11)T	8.5 (16)	6.9 (27)T	4,196 (16)	2,998 (14)	34.0 (5)	29.7 (4)	39.8 (39)	39.6 (34)T
22,683 (42)	16,578 (38)	15.1 (9)	15.7 (5)T	6.1 (29)T	6.9 (27)T	3,756 (29)	2,704 (24)	26.2 (24)T	24.5 (22)	40.9 (30)	41.2 (25)T
27,698 (21)	19,948 (14)	20.2 (46)T	21.1 (46)	4.6 (45)T	5.8 (44)	3,573 (32)	2,426 (35)	21.8 (47)T	19.6 (50)	41.6 (23)	42.3 (20)
24,819 (37)	16,894 (47)	16.8 (17)	16.8 (13)T	3.5 (51)	4.2 (48)T	3,933 (21)T	2,589 (31)	22.4 (45)	21.7 (38)T	38.2 (44)	38.9 (37)
30,728 (9)	19,918 (15)	16.8 (5)	15.9 (6)	6.6 (49)T	6.9 (45)T	3,933 (3)	3,676 (4)	29.8 (12)	26.6 (13)	35.6 (49)	36.7 (45)T
26,188 (36)	18,698 (25)	18.9 (42)	18.8 (31)T	12.8 (4)	11.3 (10)	3,886 (33)	2,785 (29)	30.8 (11)	28.4 (6)	41.8 (29)T	41.2 (25)T
36,560 (3)	23,437 (4)	15.2 (10)T	17.4 (21)	4.3 (47)T	5.9 (34)	4,997 (2)	4,288 (2)	36.1 (2)	33.5 (2)	36.7 (46)	32.9 (48)
26,988 (29)	16,947 (35)	18.2 (38)T	19.9 (38)T	7.9 (25)	11.9 (7)	3,188 (41)	2,187 (42)	23.5 (41)	22.7 (33)	43.6 (16)	48.2 (10)
21,668 (46)	17,626 (31)	18.6 (44)T	18.8 (33)T	9.6 (12)	8.4 (28)T	3,187 (39)	2,727 (23)	26.6 (22)T	24.8 (16)	44.2 (11)	39.6 (34)T
27,686 (28)	18,558 (25)	18.8 (33)T	19.7 (36)	5.5 (33)	6.3 (31)T	3,671 (31)	2,692 (32)	25.1 (30)	22.8 (32)	42.5 (28)	41.1 (28)
21,638 (47)	16,218 (43)	16.9 (23)	17.2 (17)T	5.6 (32)	9.2 (17)	3,099 (42)	2,673 (26)	24.7 (35)T	25.9 (28)	44.1 (12)T	37.6 (41)
28,068 (19)	20,305 (12)	18.3 (37)	20.3 (41)	6.6 (29)	6.9 (27)T	4,337 (15)	3,299 (6)	30.9 (7)	31.1 (3)	37.6 (45)	33.7 (50)
29,177 (14)	19,482 (18)	16.2 (19)T	17.3 (19)T	5.1 (34)T	5.3 (38)T	4,616 (11)	3,098 (12)	30.3 (10)	26.7 (12)	39.4 (38)	48.1 (5)T
32,838 (7)	21,659 (8)	15.8 (8)	16.1 (16)	4.5 (44)	5.1 (43)	4,985 (8)	3,069 (13)	32.8 (4)	27.3 (10)	45.6 (7)T	48.8 (1)
24,483 (34)	15,619 (44)	17.2 (27)T	19.8 (35)	8.9 (14)T	10.1 (13)	3,227 (43)	1,987 (46)	27.0 (17)	21.9 (37)	44.8 (9)	43.6 (8)
19,298 (51)	14,717 (48)	18.3 (33)	19.8 (7)	11.8 (2)T	11.8 (8)	3,887 (33)	2,888 (39)	29.7 (33)T	25.2 (24)	41.8 (27)T	42.8 (16)
23,283 (39)	16,288 (42)	13.6 (46)	20.9 (45)	11.1 (8)	15.8 (2)	5,837 (13)	4,889 (1)	51.5 (1)	38.6 (1)	46.6 (13)T	44.2 (11)
25,898 (27)	17,882 (33)	17.3 (29)T	18.4 (29)	7.1 (21)T	8.6 (18)	3,888 (28)	2,888 (40)	28.6 (28)	28.1 (14)	48.7 (5)T	47.5 (2)T
26,822 (45)	18,186 (27)	24.7 (51)	27.4 (51)	6.1 (39)T	6.8 (32)T	2,613 (50)	1,628 (50)	21.2 (48)	23.0 (44)	43.8 (14)	37.3 (44)
24,319 (33)	16,715 (40)	15.4 (2)	15.3 (4)	5.1 (34)T	5.7 (36)	4,399 (13)	2,795 (22)	30.8 (8)	27.4 (9)	--	36.4 (47)
27,193 (23)	17,888 (34)	16.3 (22)	17.8 (22)T	--	8.6 (26)T	3,788 (38)	2,886 (38)	22.9 (42)	20.5 (47)T	48.3 (36)	43.8 (34)T
28,217 (18)	22,956 (5)	20.2 (44)T	21.7 (47)	6.3 (29)T	6.8 (33)	3,966 (25)	2,628 (33)	32.6 (10)	28.1 (13)	36.8 (47)T	43.8 (16)T
21,736 (45)	17,129 (33)	19.2 (40)T	17.3 (19)T	7.8 (16)	8.7 (16)	3,786 (37)	2,893 (29)	24.3 (4)	20.8 (8)	48.8 (36)	41.6 (26)
29,122 (15)	19,387 (10)	16.2 (19)T	17.5 (17)T	6.7 (30)	8.8 (22)	4,883 (11)	2,938 (16)	30.7 (9)	26.5 (14)T	42.6 (21)	42.2 (21)
27,134 (24)	21,269 (9)	14.3 (4)	15.6 (1)T	8.7 (36)	8.8 (21)	3,981 (6)	3,417 (5)	40.9 (2)	27.9 (8)	41.3 (24)	44.6 (12)
938,000	949,229	17.6	18.9	6.6	7.6	$3,972	$2,736	32.7	27.7	44.7	40.3

STATE REFORMS

MINIMUM COMPETENCY TESTING FOR GRADE PROMOTION AND FOR GRADUATION AND FIRST GRADUATING CLASS ASSESSED[15] (31)	STATE INTERVENTION IN ACADEMICALLY BANKRUPT DISTRICTS AND YEAR IMPLEMENTED[16] (32)	TEACHER INCENTIVES BASED ON STUDENT PERFORMANCE[17] (33)	ALTERNATIVE TEACHER CERTIFICATION OFFERED IN STATE[18] (34)	TEACHERS REQUIRED TO TAKE CERTIFICATION EXAM.: ENTERING AND CURRENT TEACHERS[19] (35)
- GRADUATION(1985)	NO	NO	PROVISIONAL	ENTERING -
- -	NO	NO	-	- -
PROMOTION GRADUATION(1974)	NO	PILOT	PROVISIONAL/ INTERNSHIP	ENTERING -
PROMOTION -	YES (1984)	NO	PROVISIONAL	ENTERING CURRENT
PROMOTION GRADUATION(1978)	NO	NO	PROVISIONAL/ INTERNSHIP	ENTERING -
- -	NO	NO	PROVISIONAL	ENTERING -
- -	NO	NO	PROVISIONAL	ENTERING -
- GRADUATION(1981)	NO	PILOT	PROVISIONAL	ENTERING -
- GRADUATION(1983)	NO	NO	PROVISIONAL	ENTERING -
PROMOTION GRADUATION(1983)	NO	YES	PROVISIONAL	ENTERING -
PROMOTION GRADUATION(1985)	YES (1988)	YES	PROVISIONAL	ENTERING CURRENT
- GRADUATION(1985)	NO	NO	-	ENTERING -
- -	NO	NO	-	ENTERING -
- -	NO	NO	PROVISIONAL	ENTERING -
- -	NO	NO	PROVISIONAL	ENTERING -
- -	NO	NO	-	- -
- GRADUATION(1982)	NO	NO	PROVISIONAL	ENTERING -
- -	NO	NO	PROVISIONAL/ INTERNSHIP	ENTERING -
- -	NO	NO	-	ENTERING -
- -	NO	NO	-	ENTERING -
- GRADUATION(1987)	NO	NO	PROVISIONAL	ENTERING -
- -	NO	NO	PROVISIONAL	ENTERING -
- -	NO	NO	PROVISIONAL	ENTERING -
- -	NO	NO	-	- -
- GRADUATION(1984)	YES (1983)	NO	PROVISIONAL	ENTERING -
- -	NO	NO	PROVISIONAL	ENTERING -
- -	NO	NO	PROVISIONAL	ENTERING -
- GRADUATION(1978)	NO	NO	INTERNSHIP	ENTERING -
- -	NO	NO	PROVISIONAL	ENTERING -
PROMOTION GRADUATION(1986)	YES (1983)	YES	PROVISIONAL	ENTERING -
- -	NO	NO	PROVISIONAL	- -
PROMOTION GRADUATION(1982)	NO	YES	-	ENTERING -
GRADUATION(1987)	YES (1984)	NO	INTERNSHIP	ENTERING CURRENT
- -	NO	YES	-	- -
PROMOTION GRADUATION(1982)	NO	NO	PROVISIONAL	- -
- GRADUATION(1981)	NO	NO	PROVISIONAL	ENTERING -
- -	NO	NO	-	ENTERING -
- -	YES (1989)	NO	PROVISIONAL/ INTERNSHIP	ENTERING -
PROMOTION -	NO	NO	-	ENTERING -
- -	NO	NO	-	- -
-	-	-	-	-

SOURCE: U.S. Education Department

Witnesses Cite Shortcomings of Drug Rehabilitation

WASHINGTON—Economic and cultural barriers prevent many teenage drug abusers from getting the rehabilitative help they need, witnesses told a Senate panel last week.

Testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on Children, Family, Drugs, and Alcoholism, drug experts said there were not enough slots in drug-rehabilitation programs to serve all the teenagers who need such treatment. Federal officials say there are only 250,000 spaces available each year to serve the estimated 6 million adolescents and adults who need help with their drug problems.

Witnesses pointed out that many adolescents who could benefit from such services come from families that lack health insurance. Moreover, most health-insurance policies do not pay for the prolonged care that many of the teenagers require, the experts said.

Those testifying also argued that many minority teenagers with drug problems are distrustful of the health-care system and may not feel comfortable being treated by members of other racial or ethnic groups.

"Blacks may be skeptical of being treated by white professionals, Hispanics by blacks, Haitians by Asians, who do not understand 'where they are coming from,'" said Elaine Johnson, director of the Office of Substance Abuse Prevention at the National Institute on Drug Abuse.

She said her office, for the first time, is funding a program that looks at such ethnic differences. Previous projects, she said, have studied white, middle-class adolescents. —E.F.

Footnotes to 'Wall Chart'

Editor's note: Some footnotes have been left off this list because space limitations necessitated the omission of some columns from the chart on the preceding pages.

[1] Each state's score is shown in the column that designates either the American College Testing Program or the Scholastic Aptitude Test taken by most college-bound high-school students in the state.

[2] Rankings are explained in the following list. A "T" designates a tie.
Column 1: From highest (1) to lowest (28) 1988 A.C.T. score.
Column 2: From highest (1) to lowest (28) percentage.
Column 3: From highest (1) to lowest (28) percentage.
Column 4: From highest (1) to lowest (28) 1982 A.C.T. score.
Column 5: From highest (1) to lowest (28) percentage.
Column 6: From largest increase (1) to largest decrease (28) in scores between 1982 and 1988.
Column 7: From highest (1) to lowest (22) 1988 S.A.T. score.
Column 8: From highest (1) to lowest (22) percentage.
Column 9: From highest (1) to lowest (22) percentage.
Column 10: From highest (1) to lowest (22) 1982 S.A.T. score.
Column 11: From highest (1) to lowest (22) percentage.
Column 12: From largest increase (1) to largest decrease (22) in scores between 1982 and 1988.
Columns 13 & 14: From highest (1) to lowest (51) Advanced Placement rate.
Columns 15 & 16: From highest (1) to lowest (51) graduation rate.
Columns 17 & 18: From highest (1) to lowest (51) salary.
Columns 19 & 20: From highest (1) to lowest (51) ratio.
Columns 23 & 24: From highest (1) to lowest (51) percentage.
Columns 25 & 26: From highest (1) to lowest (51) expenditure.
Columns 27 & 28: From highest (1) to lowest (51) percentage.
Columns 29 & 30: From highest (1) to lowest (51) expenditure rate.

[3] A.C.T. scores and the percentages of graduates taking the exam may not be strictly comparable between 1988 and 1982. The 1988 scores and numbers of test-takers represent data for students who took the A.C.T. exam as seniors, and for those who took the test as juniors but did not take it again when they were seniors. The 1982 scores and numbers of test-takers included all test-takers.

[4] The 1988 estimated percentage of high-school graduates taking the A.C.T. or S.A.T. was calculated by dividing the number of 1988 A.C.T. or S.A.T. test-takers by the total number of 1987 public and 1980 private high-school graduates. The number of 1988 public high-school graduates was not available, nor were the later data on private high-school graduates.

[5] The 1988 percentage of A.C.T. test-takers scoring 26 and above was calculated by dividing the number of students scoring 26 and above by the total number of A.C.T. test-takers.

[6] The 1982 estimated percentage of high-school graduates taking the A.C.T. or S.A.T. was calculated by dividing the number of 1982 A.C.T. or S.A.T. test-takers by the number of 1982 public and 1980 private high-school graduates.

[7] The percentage of S.A.T. test-takers scoring 600 or above on the verbal and math test components was calculated as the percent of all test-takers scoring 600 or above on each component. Data showing those scoring 600 or more on both test components are not available. The ranking is based on the sum of the percent of the verbal and math test-takers scoring 600 or above.

[8] The 1988 advanced-placement candidates as a percentage of graduates was calculated by dividing the total number of 1988 advanced-placement candidates by the number of 1987 public high-school graduates and 1980 private high-school graduates. The number of 1988 public high-school graduates was not available, nor were the later data on private high-school graduates.

[9] The 1982 advanced-placement candidates as a percentage of graduates was calculated by dividing the total number of 1982 advanced-placement candidates by the number of 1982 public high-school graduates and 1980 private high-school graduates.

[10] Graduation rates are for public schools only because recent data on private high-school graduates were not available by state. The adjusted graduation rate was calculated by dividing the number of public high-school graduates by the public 9th-grade enrollment four years earlier. Ninth-grade enrollments include a prorated portion of the secondary-school students who were unclassified by grade. Graduation rates were also corrected for interstate population migration. Information on the number of persons of graduating age receiving G.E.D.'s is not currently available.

[11] Average annual salaries of all public-school teachers. Preliminary N.E.A. estimates for the 1988-89 school year are reported separately.

[12] The pupil/teacher ratio is the number of public elementary and secondary students divided by the number of public elementary and secondary full-time equivalent teachers.

[14] Expenditures for classroom teachers as a percent of total current expenditures were calculated by multiplying the number of classroom teachers by average teacher salaries and dividing the resulting figure by total current expenditures.

[15] States classified as having mandated minimum competency testing for grade-level promotion and/or for graduation include those where either the state or local school districts have set standards. A dash indicates that the state does not have minimum competency testing for graduating classes and/or for grade-level promotion.

[16] States classified under this category have policies to intervene in school districts where students are performing below levels specified by the state.

[17] States classified as having student performance-based programs include those that have implemented programs, funded pilot or local programs, or established mechanisms for such programs as of December 1988. A dash indicates that the state does not offer student performance-based programs.

[18] States classified as offering alternative teacher certification have programs to attract qualified candidates into teaching by modifying traditional teacher-training requirements. A dash indicates that the state does not offer alternative teacher certification. The types of certification indicated are:
Provisional: States provide this temporary certification to teachers who teach while concurrently completing state requirements for teacher certification (e.g. additional coursework, seminars, etc.).
Internship/apprenticeship: States provide this certification to candidates who meet minimum requirements (e.g. bachelor's degrees and/or other subject-area requirements). Experienced teachers assist these interns, who at the end of a specified length of time become certified.

[19] This column indicates that an examination is required for new teacher and current teacher certification in each state. A dash indicates that the state lacks examination provisions for new or current teacher certification.

[21] Washington state administers its own college-entrance examination tests. Consequently, the percentage of A.C.T. or S.A.T. test-takers is too low to classify Washington as either an A.C.T. or S.A.T. state.

[22] Alaska had a higher percentage of test-takers for S.A.T. than A.C.T. in 1988; however, it is reported as an A.C.T. state in order to maintain comparability with 1982 scores and percent of high-school graduates taking the test.

[23] Federal funds data for 1987 and 1986 for Virginia were not available. However, 1985 data were used in the calculation of the rankings to maintain comparability among the states.

[24] The number of Michigan's public high-school graduates for 1986-87 was obtained from the National Education Association's *Estimates of School Statistics, 1987-88* and after consultation with the State Education Agency. The number of public high-school graduates for 1986-87 for Nevada was obtained from the Nevada State Education Agency.

[25] The number of classroom teachers in 1987-88 for Georgia reported to N.C.E.S. included continuing-education teachers. Revised data were obtained from the State Education Agency.

[27] The number of Vermont's teachers for 1987 was not available. However, 1986 data were used in the calculation of the rankings to maintain comparability among the states.

Year and Sources of Data

Editor's note: Columns 21 and 22 were omitted from the chart on the preceding pages because of space limitations.

Column 1: Individual State Education Agencies.
Column 2: Individual State Education Agencies; National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Education Department, *Digest of Education Statistics, 1988*; N.C.E.S., unpublished preliminary data.
Column 3: Individual State Education Agencies.
Column 4: Individual State Education Agencies.
Column 5: Individual State Education Agencies; N.C.E.S., *Digest of Education Statistics, 1988*; N.C.E.S., unpublished revised data.
Column 7: The College Board.
Column 8: The College Board; Individual State Education Agencies; N.C.E.S., *Digest of Education Statistics, 1988*; N.C.E.S., unpublished preliminary data.
Column 9: The College Board.
Column 10: The College Board.
Column 11: The College Board; N.C.E.S., *Digest of Education Statistics, 1988*; N.C.E.S., unpublished revised data.
Column 13: The College Board; N.C.E.S., unpublished preliminary data.
Column 14: The College Board; N.C.E.S., *Digest of Education Statistics, 1988*.
Column 15: N.C.E.S., unpublished preliminary data; U.S. Bureau of the Census, provisional unpublished data; Individual State Education Agencies; National Education Association, *Estimates of School Statistics, 1987-88*.
Column 16: N.C.E.S., unpublished preliminary data; U.S. Bureau of the Census, unpublished data.
Column 17: N.E.A. research division, *Rankings of the States, 1988*; March 24, 1989 N.E.A. press release.
Column 18: N.E.A. research division, *Estimates of School Statistics* data file.
Column 19: N.C.E.S., unpublished preliminary data; Individual State Education Agencies.
Column 20: N.C.E.S., *Digest of Education Statistics, 1987*.
Column 23: N.C.E.S., unpublished preliminary data.
Column 24: N.C.E.S., unpublished revised data.
Column 25: N.C.E.S., unpublished preliminary data.
Column 26: N.C.E.S., unpublished revised data.
Column 27: N.C.E.S., unpublished preliminary data; U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, September 1988 press release.
Column 28: N.C.E.S., unpublished revised data; U.S.B.E.A., *Survey of Current Business*, August 1987, table 1.
Column 29: N.E.A. research division, *Rankings of the States, 1988*; N.C.E.S., unpublished preliminary data.
Column 30: N.E.A. research division, *Estimates of School Statistics* data file; N.C.E.S., unpublished revised data.
Column 31: Education Commission of the States, Clearinghouse Notes, November 1985; Individual State Education Agencies.
Column 32: E.C.S., Clearinghouse Notes, November 1985; Individual State Education Agencies.
Column 33: Southern Regional Education Board, "Is Paying for Performance Changing Schools?", *Career Ladder Clearinghouse*, December 1988.
Column 34: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, *State Issues Clearinghouse, Teacher Education in the States: 50-State Survey of Legislative and Administrative Action*, June 1988.
Column 35: A.A.C.T.E., State Issues Clearinghouse, *Teacher Education in the States: 50-State Survey of Legislative and Administrative Action*, June 1988.

Department's note: All series have been updated using the most recent data available. The data reported in the columns of the 1989 chart may vary slightly from those reported in previous charts.

ADVERTISEMENT

Where We Stand
by Albert Shanker
President, American Federation of Teachers

(NY Times Column, Sunday, March 12, 1989)

European vs. U.S. Students

Why Are We So Far Behind?

Last week I reviewed some sad facts about American education. In addition to the problems of dropouts and those who are "at risk," we're facing another major problem: We're only producing a very small percentage of students who can really do college-level work. According to reports issued by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), only 2.6% of our graduating high school seniors can write a really good letter, 6% solve a two-step arithmetic problem and 5% read and understand a short, complex article. And these percentages apply only to the 75% who are still in school and have not dropped out.

It's difficult to make international comparisons, but 17-27% of the students in the United Kingdom, Germany and France meet the standards set by those nations' national entrance examinations and assessments, which are much more demanding than the toughest in our NAEP assessments. The problem this poses for the U.S. was illustrated by a front-page story in the April 18 *Wall Street Journal* headlined, "Costly Export: Reverse 'Brain Drain' Helps Asia but Robs U.S. of Scarce Talent." Until now, the U.S. has compensated for its failure to produce enough engineers, mathematicians and scientists by employing foreign students who came here to study. But now, many of these countries, like Korea, are luring their scientists back because of the improvements back home and the opportunity to be in at the beginning of major technological development. Many U.S. companies are heavily dependent on their foreign engineers and scientists, who in some cases constitute over 25% of their scientific staff. In the future, the U.S. may have no choice but to produce its own.

Why is the U.S. in such bad shape? Why are we so far behind other western industrial countries in developing top talent? It's not possible to pinpoint exact "causes," but it's easy to see some of the key differences between our schools and theirs. Here are some important ones:

School boards vs. professionals. Only the U.S. has local school boards as we know them. The U.S. is the only place where a superintendent must face the school board in a public meeting every week or two and answer for any mishap that has occurred in the school. It is the only place where the school superintendent must manage a system and try to protect his job by maintaining majority support on the school board. In European systems, although elected officials are of course ultimately responsible to the public, school managers have much more freedom to run the schools without such direct and constant oversight.

Testing. The U.S. is the only country that places such great emphasis on standardized tests. Some countries don't use them at all. European students spend lots of time writing essays and essay answers while U.S. students spend time learning how to do well on multiple-choice tests.

Staff status and quality. Principals, teachers and superintendents are selected from the ranks of the college graduates of each country. In the European countries, college admission standards are high, which means that the quality of all their entrants and graduates is equal to our very best students.

College Admission Standards. Students in European schools work hard. Why? Because it makes a difference. If you don't do exceptionally well, you don't get into college. If you don't get good grades and take tough courses, you're less likely to get a job, or if you do get one, it will be at lower pay. In the U.S., almost anyone who wants to get into college can find one that will accept him. For those who don't go on to college, the only thing that counts with employers is the high school diploma — not what courses were taken or grades received.

Tracking. All European schools teach kids the way we do. The teachers give lessons by lecturing to the kids most of the time. What's different is the way the children are grouped. At a pretty early age, the Europeans separate kids into a number of groups. Those who can sit, listen, answer questions, retain what they hear and read and can follow at the fast rate what the teacher is saying are put into the top group. Those who can't follow as fast, sit still as long, or retain as much are given a slower and different program. A third, and bottom group, is given less talk and reading and more to do with their hands. In other words, the schools have three different systems rigidly in place; students are sorted out and placed in accordance with how well they fit the three systems.

In the U.S., we don't like tracking. It labels kids at an early age. The labels could be mistaken. And it violates our belief that schools should be a place where different kinds of kids mix. But what do we provide for all these kids who are mixed together? A version of the same education that Europeans have for their elite. Not at the same pace, of course, or many would fall behind.

Kids are different in many ways. Both Europeans and Americans acknowledge that. European schools take this into account by tracking kids — putting different kids in different programs and classes. American schools, if they want to preserve the ideal of mixing kids, should develop educational programs within classrooms and schools that allow students to learn at different rates and in different ways. But we don't. We just mix the kids and try to use the same methods used for the European elite on all our kids. When it doesn't work, we slow the pace and dilute the content. The result is a system that doesn't work for either the kids at the top or the bottom. There's no way you can take the total range of kids in a grade and give them the same lesson and the same reading assignments without boring some or baffling others.

So there's the dilemma. You can't successfully teach a classroom full of mixed-ability kids by using traditional methods. On the other hand, the early and substantial tracking employed by the Europeans — while it seems to be one of the factors that contributes to their superior results — flies in the face of our cultural values. The only way out of this dilemma is to develop schools that do things differently ... ways of teaching and learning and grouping that will achieve results that are equal to or better than those achieved by separating kids by "ability."

Reader correspondence is invited. Address your letters to Mr. Shanker at the AFT, 555 New Jersey Ave, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001.

© Albert Shanker AFT